

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 16, 22 and 30 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-15, 17-21, 23-29 and 31 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15, 17-21, 23-29 and 31 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 1-5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the terminology "further including a jig to install the installation equipment onto an installation surface, the jig comprising a jig frame shaped like a plate and having a first part of a supporting arm rotatably attached to the jig frame," which is not taught or suggested by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art. Hence, amended claims 1 and 11 include the features of claims 16 and 22, respectively, together with a portion of claims 15 and 21, respectively, and are submitted to be in allowable form.

Thus, amended claims 1 and 11 are submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art. Since claims 2-5 depend from amended claim 1, claims 2-5 are submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 6, 27-29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, in view of Uehara (USPN 6,145,797). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the terminology “further including a jig to install the installation equipment onto an installation surface, the jig comprising a jig frame shaped like a plate and having a first part of a supporting arm rotatably attached to the jig frame,” which is not taught or suggested by JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797). Thus, amended claim 1 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797), alone or in combination.

Since claim 6 depends from amended claim 1, claim 6 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797), alone or in combination, for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797), alone or in combination.

In accordance with the allowable subject matter set forth by the Examiner, the amendment of claim 27 by the addition of the features of claim 30 and cancellation of claim 30 without prejudice or disclaimer is submitted to place claim 27 in form for allowance. Since claims 28-29 depend from amended claim 27, claims 28-29 are submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claim 27 is submitted to be allowable.

Claim 31 was amended in accordance with the amendment to claim 27. Thus, amended claim 31 is submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claim 27 is submitted to be allowable.

B. In the Office Action, at pages 4-5, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art, in view of Uehara (USPN 6,145,797) and Sweere et al. (USPN 5,918,841). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the terminology “further including a jig to install the installation equipment onto an installation surface, the jig comprising a jig frame shaped like a plate and having a first part of a supporting arm rotatably attached to the jig frame,” which is not taught or suggested by JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797) and/or Sweere et al. (USPN 5,918,841). Thus, amended claim 1 is

submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797) and/or Sweere et al. (USPN 5,918,841), alone or in combination.

Since claim 7 depends from amended claim 1, claim 7 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797) and/or Sweere et al. (USPN 5,918,841), alone or in combination, for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Uehara (USPN 6,145,797) and/or Sweere et al. (USPN 5,918,841), alone or in combination.

C. In the Office Action, at pages 5-6, claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, in view of Kaplan et al. (USPN 4,558,839). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the terminology "further including a jig to install the installation equipment onto an installation surface, the jig comprising a jig frame shaped like a plate and having a first part of a supporting arm rotatably attached to the jig frame," which is not taught or suggested by JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Kaplan et al. (USPN 4,558,839). Thus, amended claims 1 and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Kaplan et al. (USPN 4,558,839), alone or in combination.

Since claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 depend from amended claims 1 and 11, respectively, claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Kaplan et al. (USPN 4,558,839), alone or in combination, for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Kaplan et al. (USPN 4,558,839), alone or in combination.

D. In the Office Action, at page 7, claims 15, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-344934, Applicant's Figure 1 Prior Art, in view of Ditmer (USPN 6,402,109). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the

Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the terminology “further including a jig to install the installation equipment onto an installation surface, the jig comprising a jig frame shaped like a plate and having a first part of a supporting arm rotatably attached to the jig frame,” which is not taught or suggested by JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art and/or Ditmer (USPN 6,402,109). Thus, amended claims 1 and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Ditmer (USPN 6,402,109), alone or in combination.

Since claims 15, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 26 depend from amended claims 1 and 11, respectively, claims 15, 18, 20, 21, 24 and 26 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Ditmer (USPN 6,402,109), alone or in combination, for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2000-344934, Applicant’s Figure 1 Prior Art, and/or Ditmer (USPN 6,402,109), alone or in combination.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The features of claim 30 have been incorporated into claim 27, and claim 30 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claim 27 is submitted to be in allowable form.

Claims 16 and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 17 and 23 have been amended to show proper antecedent basis after cancelling claims 16 and 22. Since claims 1 and 11 have been amended and are submitted to be in allowable form, claims 10, 14, 17, 19, 23 and 25 are submitted to be in allowable form.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further

outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

January 3, 2005 By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501